

REMARKS

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and the rejection of claim 36 for similar reasons.

There is no teaching or suggestion by Mason that a server is controlling video system 28. Furthermore, Applicant fails to find any details by Mason as to how security is accomplished. Mason only makes passing references to security, as the problem he is solving is customer assistance. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a server to control a number of security devices as claimed by Applicant.

With respect to independent claim 25, Mason fails to teach or suggest:

a server for receiving an event message from the self-checkout station containing an event indicative of a security violation during a transaction and self-checkout station identification information, for assigning a priority level based upon the event, and for generating an alert message containing the event and the priority level if the priority level is at least a threshold priority level;

a security controller for parsing the alert message to obtain the event, the priority level, and the self-checkout station identification information, for determining one of the security devices and a control procedure from the priority level, and for generating a control message for controlling the one security device in accordance with the control procedure.

Claims 26-29, 31-32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Blackshear. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

With respect to claims 26-27, Mason fails to teach a server for controlling video system 28.

With respect to claims 28-29 and 30-32, the passage cited by the Examiner relates to display of a message informing the supervisor that a customer has entered a request for intervention. See previous paragraph, lines 13-17, as well. The passage does not state that display 60 displays images from video system 28.

As noted by the Examiner, Mason also does not disclose station and event identifiers in the control message. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assumption that station and event identifiers must necessarily be

included in the control message and can be inferred absent any teaching or suggestion of such a need.

Mason fails to disclose that "the one security device is an image data recording device and the control message directs a video stream from a camera at the self-checkout station to the image data recording device" (Claim 28), "the one security device is an image display device and the control message directs a video stream from a camera at the self-checkout station to the image data display device" (Claim 29), "the security controller includes a station identifier in the video stream" (Claim 31), and "the security controller includes an event identifier in the video stream" (Claim 32).


With respect to claim 35, Mason fails to disclose that the server of claim 25 is another self-checkout station.

For similar reasons as stated above in support of claims 25-29, 31-32 and 35, Applicant believes that claims 30, 33, 34, 36-44 are allowable.

Applicant has noted the prior art made of record but not relied upon.

Applicant now respectfully requests that the pending
claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Martin
Attorney for Applicant
(937) 445-2990

Dayton, OH

NOV - 1 2005